

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 17, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are amended and Applicant submits that the claims meet the requirements of § 112, second paragraph.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-29 under § 102(e)

Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jacobs (USP 6,710,786).

The Examiner's asserts that Jacobs anticipates the elements of independent claims 1, 11 and 21. However, Applicant submits that Jacobs does not teach each and every element of the claims as discussed below.

Jacobs is directed to a method for incorporating state information (i.e. identity of a client, ID and status of an operation) into a Uniform Resource Locator. See col. 3, line 4-6. As illustrated by Figs. 3A and 3B of Jacobs, a browser 202 (e.g. client) sends a request to a listener 210 (e.g. server). The listener forwards the request to a transport adapter 212 using the

proprietary programming interface of the listener 210. The transport adapter 212 then converts the request as necessary to pass the request to dispatcher 214. The dispatcher 21 identifies the request object type based on the virtual path specified in the browser request. If the object type corresponds to a cartridge, the virtual path manager also indicates whether authentication is required.

Claim 1 recites “receiving an *input object*, wherein the received *input object* contains *input data* and *one input function* executable on a computer.” The Examiner asserts that Step 352 of Fig. 3A discloses this aspect of claim 1. In Step 352, the listener 210 passes forward a request by a browser to a web application server 280. In particular, the listener 210 passes the browser request to a transport adaptor 212. The transport adaptor 212 then converts the browser request as necessary to pass the request to dispatcher 214. Jacobs discloses that the browser request includes “a context object that contains data required for the proper operation of the cartridge. The data required for proper operation of a cartridge may include, for example, a transaction ID that identifies a transaction with which the browser request is associated.” Col. 9, lines 20-25.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the input object *contains* input data *and* one input function executable on a computer. A transaction ID, which the Examiner appears to be citing for teaching the claimed input function, is merely an identification of a transaction which is *associated* with the browser. There is no teaching or suggestion that a request (input object as cited by the Examiner) contains an input function.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. Since claims 11 and 21 recite similar elements, claims 11 and 21 and their dependent claims should also be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Rejection of Claims 10, 20 and 30 under § 103(a)

Claims 10, 20 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Nakai (USP 6,253,248). Claims 10, 20 and 30 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 11 and 21 for the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Nakai does not cure the deficiencies of Jacobs.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No.: 09/364,370

Attorney Docket No.: A8494

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 17, 2005